Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 4A, 4B, 4C; 5A, 5B, 5C; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7A, 7B; 7C; 8A, 8B, 8C; 9A, 9B, 9C. These sheet, which includes Fig. 4A, 4B, 4C; 5A, 5B, 5C; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7A, 7B; 7C; 8A, 8B, 8C; 9A, 9B, 9C, replaces the original sheets including Fig. 4A, 4B, 4C; 5A, 5B, 5C; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7A, 7B; 7C; 8A, 8B, 8C; 9A, 9B, 9C.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Examiner's Office Action dated April 6, 2005. Of the 20 claims pending at that time, claims 1-8, 14, 15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 9-13 and 16-18 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Further, the Office Action objected to the drawings and certain informalities within claims 11 and 20. In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of all pending claims, including newly added claims 21 and 22.

The Office Action objected to claims 11 and 20 as containing several informalities. Applicants have amended claims 11 and 22 to correct the informalities noted within the Office Action. Submitted herewith are replacement sheets which address the objections made in the Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 14, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,529 issued to Liang et al. ("Liang"). With respect to independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts the column 7, lines 48-66 of Liang teaches all the limitations of originally filed independent claim 1. Column 7, lines 48-66 recite:

> As aforementioned, the CALL SETUP message is formatted with a routing DTL information element, and that information element includes a concatenation of six byte elements which according to a preferred aspect of the invention includes a four bit flag field. In accord with the

> invention, the four flags include a "process" flag, a "link up" flag is used to indicate whether an element of the DTL has been processed by a node. Thus, when a node receives the DTL, it looks for the first element of the DTL which has not had the process flag set. That element should include the node ID of the receiving node. Upon finding the appropriate DTL element, the receiving node changes the process flag of the element. Inserts the input slot ID and input link (i.e., the receiving port) values in their appropriate fields, and designates a VPI/VCI for that element. Then, the receiving node forwards the message with the updated DTL to the output port designated by the DTL (typically via a cross-connect switch) even if peer boundaries are crossed.

The cited section of Liang reproduced above clearly recites generating a new DTL. Specifically, the reproduced section notes that upon finding the appropriate DTL element, the receiving node changes the process flag of the element, inserts the input slot ID, and output length (i.e., the receiving port) that is in their appropriate fields, and designates a VPI/VCI for that element.

Claim 1 has been amended so that the message received by the first network includes data and a DTL. Claim 1 recites that the first network switch generates first data as a function of both the data and the first interface identifier data. There is a clear distinction between "the data" of the message received by the first network switch and the "DTL" of the message received by the first network switch. Claim 1 does not recite generating first data as a function of the DTL. Given that the cited section of Liang speaks to generating modified DTL as a function of a

received DTL, it follows that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited section of Liang.

Claims 2-13 depend from independent claim 1. Insofar as independent claim 1 has been shown to be patentably distinguishable, it follows that claims 2-13 are likewise patentably distinguishable.

Independent claims 14 and 20 were rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of independent claim 1. Independent claims 14 and 20 have been amended along the lines similar to that of independent claim 1. As such, the arguments made with respect to claim 1 apply equally to independent claims 14 and 20. Amended independent claims 14 and 20 are patentably distinguishable over Liang.

Claims 15-18 depend from independent claim 14. Insofar as independent claim 14 has been shown to be patentably distinguishable, it follows that claims 15-18 are likewise patentably distinguishable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on 7/6/05.

Attorney for Applicant(s) — Date of Signature 7/6/05

Respectfully submitted,

Eric A. Stephenson
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099